

Let us put this in perspective: 14 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product would equal over \$1 trillion. This breathtaking figure would be 61 percent of the Federal budget. The IMF is engaging in a policy of privatizing the profits and socializing the losses. So instead of helping beleaguered nations, the American taxpayer is guaranteeing a return of investment, of course with a profit attached, to the various investment institutions and investors who knew that they were engaging in highly risky investments. The protected markets, not the open ones, are in trouble.

The financial crisis in East Asia is not the result of excess capitalism. The crisis has been caused and exacerbated by the Asian economies that have been forcibly insulated from the free market through quasi-protectionist practices, especially as it concerns banning foreign financial services to operate in these markets.

The Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank, reports, quote, the financial crisis in Asia is a culmination of decades of hands-on government regulation of the region's economies, distrust of foreign capital and competition, concentration of power in a family-owned business group with close ties to the government, and closed financial systems and quotes.

As the case with Japan, which has experienced nearly a decade-long recession, these Asian nations have created managed economies by picking economic winners and losers instead of allowing competition to sort out the free market winners and losers. By trying to guide their economies through bureaucratic hands, Thailand, Indonesia, and South Korea have worsened their economic crisis because they have been incapable of taking immediate action to fight the effects of a growing economic free fall. The IMF can lull nations into complacency by acting as a self-appointed leader of last resort.

This fund was originally created in 1944 to assist in global trade by supporting currency convertibility and providing needed financing to defend exchange rates. The purpose of the IMF was entirely dissolved with the demise of the fixed exchange system in 1937 and the advent of international capital markets. But instead of putting the IMF out of business as it should have been, the IMF was allowed by its member nations to redefine itself by becoming a lender to developing nations. Such a change in its mandate automatically increased the risk to its reserve funds and duplicated the efforts of other international financial institutions such as the World Bank.

The IMF money has made investors more reckless with their decisions because they have come to expect that this money will be an insurance plan against the risk of investing in questionable economic settings in foreign nations. They realize their investments will be practically guaranteed. Instead of making wise business decisions, cer-

tain investors and institutions get consumed with the thought of great profits despite significant risks.

Most importantly this crisis should teach the world, especially in countries like Japan and China, that true economic reform is needed to wean nations off managed economic policies. By allowing the free market to rule, the nations of East Asia will have the security to avoid these economic downturns that currently have befallen them. Asian nations are facing financial difficulties, not because of outside forces having imposed bad economic policies on them, but because they have imposed these bad policies on themselves.

#### NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY EXPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on January 12 of this year, the Clinton administration issued a statement certifying that China had provided clear and unequivocal assurances to the United States that it is not assisting and will not assist any nonnuclear weapons State either directly or indirectly in acquiring nuclear explosive devices or the material components of such devices. This is the first time in 12 years that a U.S. President has granted such a certification.

I am greatly disturbed by this statement. As many Members of this body are aware, China is a major supplier of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear and missile technology. We have less than 30 days to take action and either reject or accept the certification.

Mr. Speaker, when the United States and China had signed an accord in 1985 to allow American firms to export nuclear technology to China, Members of Congress were concerned over China's sales of nuclear weapons technology to third countries. In response, Congress quickly passed legislation that required the President to first certify that China has not sold or transferred nuclear technology to countries that are not subject to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency. In granting this certification, the Clinton administration has chosen to overlook China's recent transfer of nuclear technology to unregulated nuclear facilities in Pakistan and Iran. The administration has accepted a so-called assurance by Beijing that it would cancel or postpone indefinitely several projects, especially secret nuclear facilities in Pakistan and a uranium conversion facility in Iran, as the basis for the United States granting the certification.

The administration continues to overlook CIA findings that the Chinese have sold 5,000 ring magnets to Pakistan for its uranium enrichment facility. The ring magnets were transferred

to a laboratory in Pakistan, and the facility is named after the founder of Pakistan's nuclear weapons program. I would like to note that ring magnets are used for the building of nuclear weapons.

The administration has overlooked, in my opinion, a CIA report that described the Chinese sale of a special industrial furnace and high-tech diagnostic equipment to Pakistan. The furnace and diagnostic equipment have dual use and can be used to melt plutonium as well as uranium for nuclear weapons. Furthermore, by granting the certification the administration is willing to approve China's continued support of Pakistan's commitment to build a plutonium production reactor and a plutonium reprocessing plant. These facilities are essential for a nuclear weapons program.

Despite the repeated protests by Members of this body, China continues to assist Pakistan in building a sophisticated nuclear arsenal. Unfortunately, this nuclear arsenal is not subject to international inspection. Furthermore, the administration continues to look the other way as China continues to export technology and ballistic and missile components to Pakistan. I would like to remind my colleagues that Pakistan is not a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency and bans investigators from several of its nuclear facilities. Members of this body have supported and at times insisted that China receive United States peaceful nuclear technology only if China halts all nuclear exports to nations with unregulated nuclear facilities.

Last year a letter was sent to President Clinton by Members of this body stating that China has not earned or behaved in a manner that warrants such certification. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's annual report to Congress stated that while the administration could not stipulate a violation, questions remained about contacts between Chinese entities and elements associated with Pakistan's nuclear weapons program.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that many of my colleagues will support legislation that rejects the administration's granting of this certification. We have less than 30 days to act. We must send a message to the Chinese that we will not turn our heads away and accept its nuclear weapons relations with Pakistan. We should not accept the assurances made by the Chinese when they have continually failed to be responsible and act responsibly as a member of the international proliferation community.

#### CONFIRMATION OF DR. SATCHER AS U.S. SURGEON GENERAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a student of the Constitution, I am reminded of the wisdom of the Founding Fathers in establishing three branches of government. Also recognizing as the President is the head of this Nation that there should be advice and consent from the other body of this Congress. All of us as Americans respect that process and have watched that process help govern this Nation for the years that it has been a Nation under our Constitution.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would argue very vigorously today that there is a crisis in government and one that must be remedied by the people. We recognize that in this three branches of government there are checks and balances. But there should not be a runaway government.

We understand through statistical analysis and polls that this President was reelected because there were the view of the American people that they wanted to go in a direction of moderation, not in a radical right direction. And so they voted for a President that they thought would have the powers to select the judiciary for the 21st century. In that judiciary would be combined individuals who would decide cases in a moderate and respectful manner of the law. It would include judges who affirmed and approved and understood that affirmative action was still legal.

But it seems, however, that the other body refuses to confirm and affirm those appointments by the President of the United States who cannot pass their own political litmus test. This is a travesty and this is against the underpinnings of advice and consent that have been given under the Constitution. We need to stop this runaway process. We need to allow the President of the United States to appoint those judges that are needed, some 81 vacancies, denying the American people their justice and saying to those who believe under the Constitution that issues like affirmative action and choice are the law of the land being rejected because they do not pass a political litmus test.

We come again to another crisis, Mr. Speaker. That is the confirmation of Dr. Satcher, Dr. Satcher, who has been nominated by the President of the United States to be the U.S. Surgeon General and be the Assistant Secretary of Health at the Department of Health and Human Services, someone who is a fine scholar but also a medical professional.

The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a State depends. This was spoken by Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, in a speech in 1877.

What we find here is a bottleneck in the other body, using an unfortunate and negative litmus test to refuse to confirm Dr. Satcher. He has had a distinguished career, an eloquent spokesperson and a proven health profes-

sional. He qualifies to succeed in this role.

The surgeon general's job is to develop medical consensus and articulate a broad public health vision, tasks for which Dr. Satcher is well prepared. As Director of the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, the Administrator of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Diseases Registry, and as the former president of Meharry Medical College, Dr. Satcher has made a lasting impression on the public health of this Nation. In fact, through his leadership at the CDC, childhood immunization rates have increased dramatically, growing from 55 percent in 1992 to 78 percent, and vaccine-preventable childhood diseases have been reduced to the lowest level in American history.

Under Dr. Satcher's direction, the CDC has also placed a greater emphasis on prevention. For example, the CDC's comprehensive breast and cervical cancer screening program increased from 18 to 50 States, and the agency highlighted the importance of physical activity and good health by encouraging Americans to become more physically active.

Why, however, is Dr. Satcher's confirmation being held up? Because of some false litmus test about abortion. Because of some belief that he may be prochoice or pro a procedure, none of which should have anything to do with the head of this country's medical message being confirmed or not confirmed, particularly when Dr. Satcher has indicated that it is his desire to lead this country in a comprehensive way of providing an opportunity for more Americans to be healthy.

He is highly respected and supported by the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of Pediatrics, Dr. Louis Sullivan, the President of Morehouse School of Medicine and former Secretary of Health and Human Services under Republican administrations, and numerous other medical groups.

The Office of Surgeon General has been vacant too long. This is a travesty.

Dr. Satcher wrote in 1977 to Senator WILLIAM FRIST, himself a doctor: Let me state unequivocally that I have no intention of using the position of Assistant Secretary for Health and Surgeon General to promote issues related to abortion. That is it, plain and simple. What more do you need? You cannot take away from an individual his right to his opinions and his belief. Stop the travesty. Follow the Constitution. Proceed with the advice and consent from the other body, proceed to nominate and affirm judges that can be independent and Surgeon Generals that can be independent.

□ 1300

# NAME CHANGE FOR WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT SHOULD NOT HAPPEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this House will take up a bill to strip George Washington's name from Washington National Airport and to rename it the Ronald Reagan National Airport.

I oppose this legislation. My opposition and the opposition of other Members to this bill has nothing to do with personal feelings about President Reagan and his family. In fact, we wish them the best. The debate on this bill should not be about President Reagan or his policies.

I want to repeat this. This debate is not about President Reagan or how best to honor his legacy, this debate is about the majority's efforts to push through a bill that will have serious consequences with little debate and no serious consideration.

In the 7 years I have been a Member of Congress I have never seen greater arrogance than has been exhibited by the majority party in their efforts to enact this legislation. This is an arrogant abuse of power. Washington National Airport is in my district. I have never been consulted about this legislation. I was never asked to appear at a hearing, because there was no hearing. And no one from the other side has even bothered to ask my constituents what they thought about it. If they had, they would find that we do not want this name changed.

Every Member of this House should think how they would feel if the Congress were to vote tomorrow to rename the airport in their district without even consulting them. This bill was drafted without consulting Senators WARNER and ROTH, Virginia's representatives in the other body.

This bill was drafted without consulting the Washington Metropolitan Airport Authority, the body that Ronald Reagan created to govern the Washington National Airport. It was drafted without consulting the Federal Aviation Administration that has to change all the tickets and the rerouting and their whole computer network. The airlines operating out of National were not consulted or the businesses located around the airport in my district. Each of these entities will be significantly and adversely impacted by this bill and each deserves a voice in this decision.

Rather than honor Ronald Reagan and his family and his philosophy of devolving Federal power to State and local governments, this Congress is completely ignoring the expressed wishes of local government when it acts in such an imperious, dictatorial manner. Both Arlington County and